

## **REMARKS**

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 10 has been amended to require “a nonionic surfactant having two or more aromatic rings in a molecule”, based on the description in paragraph [0035] of the U.S. Publication No. 2006/0201664 A1, which corresponds to page 10, lines 14-17 of Applicant’s specification.

New claim 14 has been added to the application, based on the description in paragraph [0034] of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0201664 A1, which corresponds to page 10, lines 2-13 of Applicant’s specification.

Therefore, no new matter has been added to the application by the above-amendments.

### **Consideration After Final Rejection**

Although this response is presented after final rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments and consider the remarks, as they place the application in condition for allowance.

### **Patentability Arguments**

The patentability of the present invention over the disclosure of the reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the following remarks.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The rejection of claims 10, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babinec et al. (U.S. 6,380,294) is respectfully traversed.

*The Position of the Examiner*

The Examiner takes the position that Babinec et al. teach a polyaniline-containing composition comprising polyaniline, a dopant, an inorganic compound and water, wherein the dopant is a polymer having an acid group such as a phosphoric acid group, sulfonic acid group or carboxyl group. The Examiner admits that Babinec et al. do not teach the specific amount of the dopant, or emulsion polymers in the composition. However, the Examiner takes the position that Babinec et al. teach that the amount of dopants are sufficient that the doped polyaniline will reach the maximum conductivity, and that the amount of dopant will not exceed the amount of polyaniline that is needed to be doped. Therefore, the Examiner takes the position that it is obvious that the amount of dopants would be optimized to fall in the range as set by the Applicant, because the amount of polyaniline is within the range as recited in the claim.

*Applicant's Arguments*

Applicant asserts that the subject matter of the amended claims is patentable over the cited reference for the following reasons.

A polyaniline generally has extremely low solubility in water or a solvent. Even when a polyaniline is forcibly dispersed in water or a solvent, it is difficult to prepare a coated film in which the polyaniline is uniformly dispersed because of extremely strong cohesive force and poor dispersion state of the polyaniline. (Please see paragraph [0004] in the publication, which corresponds to the paragraph spanning pages 1 and 2 of Applicant's specification.)

However, the polyaniline-containing composition of Applicant's claim 1 includes a nonionic surfactant having two or more aromatic rings in a molecule, which has a high affinity with the polyaniline. As a result, the micelle is kept more reliably in the emulsion state, and therefore the composition is stabilized in a state that the polyaniline is uniformly dispersed. (Please see paragraph [0035] in the publication, which corresponds to page 10, lines 14-17 of Applicant's specification.) The effect of the polyaniline-containing composition comprising a nonionic surfactant having two or more aromatic rings in a molecule is demonstrated in Examples 4-6 and 9-11 of Applicant's specification.

On the contrary, Babinec et al. fail to teach or suggest that a blend of polymeric materials

includes a nonionic surfactant. Accordingly, Babinec et al. clearly fail to teach or suggest a nonionic surfactant having two or more aromatic rings in a molecule, as required in Applicant's claim 1.

Additionally, Babinec et al. do not recognize the object of Applicant's invention, i.e. improving the dispersion of the polyaniline, which has low solubility in water or a solvent. (Please see paragraph [0007] in the publication, which corresponds to page 2, lines 16-20 of Applicant's specification.) Further, Babinec et al. do not disclose the technical idea of improving dispersion of the polyaniline uniformly and stably in a composition containing water.

Accordingly, the subject matter of independent claim 10, and dependent claims 11, 13 and 14, is not obvious over Babinec et al.

For these reasons, the above rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the ground of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hayahide YAMASAKI

By: 

Amy E. Schmid  
Registration No. 55,965  
Attorney for Applicant

AES/emj  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
September 8, 2008